

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-16 are pending. Of those claims, claims 5-13 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Remaining claims 1-4 and 14-16 are not rejected in view of any art.

By the Amendment herewith, Applicant clarifies the wording of claims 1-16. These clarifications are not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents for all elements should remain intact. Additionally, claim 1 is amended as suggested by the Examiner to recite "with use of a processor."

Claims 17-20 have been added to recite "means" terminology. See, for example, claim 5 for support. Support for the recitation of "an alternating pair of line memories" in claims 18-20 can be found in the specification and in the second line of claim 7. Support for the recitation of "each line memory having the width of an output image" in claims 18-20 also can be found in the specification at page 5, line 31.

Additionally, the specification is amended to recite section headings, and the reference to claims 1, 5 and 14 has been replaced with the original text of these claims.

The Abstract also is amended, as suggested by the Examiner.

No new matter is introduced into the application as a result of the foregoing clarifications.

Referring now to the outstanding Office Action, as noted above claims 5-13 are allowed.

At page 2 of the Action, the Abstract appears to be objected to as not being in the proper format. Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has clarified the wording of the Abstract in the interest of advancing the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is warranted.

Claims 1-4 and 14-16 are then rejected under 35 USC Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has

clarified independent claims 1 and 14, from which claims 3-4 and 15-16 respectively depend, as suggested by the Examiner at page 4 of the Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection also is warranted.

For completion, it is respectfully pointed out that claim 1 is still believed to be allowable in view of the deletion of "characterized in that the coloured matrix image is read only once."

Newly added independent claim 17 also is believed to be patentable in view of the art of record for at least the reason that claim 5 is allowable. Newly added dependent claims 18-20 also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati Feb. 18, 2010
Christine Wilkes Beninati Date
Reg. No.: 37,967

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

[Signature] 2-18-2010
Name of Person Making Deposit Date